

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,194	02/13/2002	Pao-Yu Lin	DED/3076/131	5281
759	90 07/14/2004		EXAMINER	
DAVID E. DOUGHERTY SUITE 1404			STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F	
5205 LEESBURG PIKE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041			3761	
			DATE MAIL ED. 07/14/200	4

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	v			
	10/073,194	LIN, PAO-YU				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jacqueline F Stephens	3761				
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addres	is			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply wany reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a renication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt yetory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ill, by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commu ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .					
	o)⊠ This action is non-final.	•				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restricti	e withdrawn from consideration.	,	·			
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any object						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including t						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
_ , , ,	ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received in A f the priority documents have been al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	ge			
Attachment(s)	_					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT 		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	-, m	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)			

Application/Control Number: 10/073,194 Page 2

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites the limitation "EVA", without defining the abbreviated term. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guevara et al. US Patent Application Publication 2001/0003797 in view of Osborn USPN 4964857.

As to claim 1, Guevara discloses an environmentally friendly degradable diaper. Guevara discloses the diaper contains an EVA material, LDPE, stearic acid, polyethylene, and calcium carbonate (Abstract and paragraphs 0036, 0038, 0041, and 0068). However, with respect to the limitations of percentages of the claimed materials, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claim limitations nor any unexpected results arising therefrom, and that as such the limitations were arbitrary and therefore obvious. Such unsupported limitations cannot be a basis for patentability, since where patentability is said to be based upon particular

Art Unit: 3761

dimensions or another variable in the claim, the applicant must show that the chosen variables are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ 2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). One having ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine through routine experimentation the ideal levels of components for a particular application.

Guevara does not disclose wax is used as a component. Osborn discloses the use of natural wax in a biodegradable disposable diaper because wax has moisture repellent properties and is capable of complete biodegradation within a few weeks time (Osborn col. 2, lines 37-51). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate wax in the invention of Guevara for the benefits disclosed in Osborn.

As to claims 2-4, the limitations regarding the sanitary napkins, pants-shaped diapers, and sanitary pads are directed to an intended use of the article. Intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim limitations.

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F Stephens whose telephone number is (703) 308-8320. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Calvert can be reached on (703)305-1025. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacqueline F Stephens

Examiner

Art Unit 3761

July 12, 2004